

## REMARKS

Claims 21-42 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks.

Claims 21-25, 28, and 31-38 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Riskin (USPN 5,031,206). The rejection stated essentially that Riskin teaches all the limitations of Claims 21-25, 28, and 31-38.

Claim 21 claims, *inter alia*, "outputting one of a plurality of known words matched from said look-up-table based on a higher probability dependent from a category of a previously matched word in a sentence including the output word and the previously matched word." Claim 31 claims, *inter alia*, "a keyboard for outputting said string of digits to said database, said keyboard having a plurality of keys, each of which outputting a digit representing more than one letters, wherein said processor executes said program to cause an output of a word from said database based on said string of digits received from said keyboard and a category of a previously matched word in a sentence including the output word and the previously matched word."

Riskin teaches resolving letter ambiguities within a word (see Abstract). Riskin does not teach "outputting one of a plurality of known words matched from said look-up-table based on a higher probability dependent from a category of a previously matched word in a sentence including the output word and the previously matched word" as claimed in Claim 21, nor "an output of a word from said database based on said string of digits received from said keyboard and a category of a previously matched word in a sentence including the output word and the previously matched word" as claimed in Claim 31. Riskin teaches letter-at-a-time processing for

resolving ambiguities at the letter level (see for example, col. 7, lines 53-54). At the most, Riskin teaches the extraction of snippets (see col. 8, lines 37-47). Riskin does not teach ambiguities resolved using a “category of a previously matched word in a sentence including the output word” as claimed in Claims 21 and 31. Therefore, Riskin fails to teach all the limitations of Claims 21 and 31.

Claims 22-25, and 28 depend from Claim 21. Claims 32-38 depend from Claim 31. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for the respective independent claims. The Examiner’s reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 26, 27, 29, 30, and 39 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riskin in view of Church et al. (USPN 5,541,836). The rejection stated essentially that the combined teachings of Riskin and Church teach or suggest all the limitations of Claims 26, 27, 29, 30, and 39.

Claims 26, 27, 29, and 30 depend from Claim 21. Claim 39 depends from Claim 31. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for the respective independent claims.

Further, with respect to Claim 29, 30, and 39, Official Notice has been taken that “said look-up table is a listing on non-English characters correlated with predetermined digits string based on phonetics” is well known in the art. Applicants disagree that one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made would have found it obvious to recognize that a look-up table could be a list of non-English characters – for example, Riskin has no facility to address whole words, much less characters that may correspond to a string of digits. If the Examiner is relying on personal knowledge to support the finding of what is known in the art, the

Examiner must provide an affidavit or declaration setting forth specific factual statements and explanation to support the finding. Such an affidavit is respectfully requested.

The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.


New Claim 40 is believed to be allowable over the prior art of record. For example, the prior art of record is not believed to teach or suggest "determining a known character if there is a match from said matching of the known word; and outputting a character corresponding to the known word, wherein ambiguities in determining the known character are resolved according to a sentence reconstruction" as claimed in Claim 40.

Claims 41 and 42 depend from Claim 40. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claim 40.

For the forgoing reasons, the application, including Claims 21-42, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

  
Nathaniel T. Wallace  
Reg. No. 48,909  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

**F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC**  
130 Woodbury Road  
Woodbury, New York 11797  
TEL: (516) 692-8888  
FAX: (516) 692-8889